

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5121

munist conspiracy to penetrate nationalist movements, to pervert them, and to pirate them for their own evil objectives.

To dominate—if they can—the eternal impulse of national patriotism, they use force and threats of force, subversion and bribery, propaganda and spurious promises. They deny the dignity of men and have subjected many millions to the execution of master plans dictated in faraway places.

Communism demands subservience to a single ideology, to a straitjacket of ideas and approaches and methods. Freedom of individuals or nations to them is intolerable.

Mr. Speaker, in studying recent history, it is well for us to note that in the last 8 years the Soviet monster has been prevented by our effective foreign policy from seizing control of any free nation whereas in the preceding 8 years, 1944-52, the following nations and their brave peoples lost their freedom: Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Roumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria.

We must keep them in mind at all times especially, as I indicated above, in our commemorative occasions in Captive Nations Week. While we have arrested the spread of communism, and have rededicated ourselves to rolling back the Iron Curtain, the nations of the free world have been granting freedom to lands once subject to their control. President Eisenhower, in addressing the Philippine Congress aptly described this as follows:

Since 1945, 33 lands that were once subject to Western control have peaceably achieved self-determination. These 33 countries have a population of almost a billion people. During the same period, 12 countries in the Sino-Soviet sphere have been forcibly deprived of their independence. The question might be asked: Who are today the colonialists?

Certainly, though we may disagree in detail, we are all united in the fundamental principle that the torch of freedom must be carried to the remotest corners of the earth. In these days of increased international tension, the people of the United States are giving their wholehearted support to a Chief Executive who is effectively dedicating himself to true world peace, and who, by his actions and affirmative pronouncements, has carried to millions of people in the nations he recently has visited the true story of the love of freedom and the heart of humanity that is so symbolic of our national foreign policy.

Granting Representation in the Electoral College to the District of Columbia

SPEECH
OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 757) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support House Joint Resolution 757 which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide voting rights for the residents of the District of Columbia by granting representation in the electoral college.

Mr. Chairman, the framers of the Constitution did a magnificent job in providing guidelines and protecting individual rights of the citizens of this great Republic. It is a true charter for free men living with one another in peace and harmony. No other Constitution has stood such rigid tests or served as well so many men. This Constitution has served this Nation throughout its history with few major amendments. It has been used as a model by our many States and many independent countries. Therefore, I have no criticism to offer about the work of our Founding Fathers in the drafting of this important document. It is possible that the failure to provide a vote for the residents of the District of Columbia was an oversight but it is also possible that the Founding Fathers assumed that anyone working in the Federal city would have permanent residence in some other State. Regardless of the reason for this omission it is time that we take affirmative action in granting the right to vote to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the proposed constitutional amendment and hope that favorable action will be taken before this Congress adjourns.

Salary Increases for Postal and Other Federal Employees

SPEECH
OF

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 9883, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mrs. GRANAHAH. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support and urge favorable action on H.R. 9883, a bill to reaffirm the historic policy of Congress that employees of the Government of the United States shall receive fair compensation for the great public service they perform.

To state the objective differently, the bill recognizes that the high quality of service which is required for the conduct of the Government's business warrants recognition, in terms of salaries and wage rates, at least equal to that which is given to comparable services in private enterprise which is protected and supported by the Government.

As originally reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, this bill would provide fair and reasonable compensation comparable to that enjoyed by employees in private industry by giving a 9-percent across-the-board pay increase to those categories of Fed-

eral employees consistently included in salary legislation. As now amended, it provides a somewhat lesser raise of 7½ percent, which is certainly not excessive in any event and represents a sincere effort to make sure that this legislation does not end in a stalemate between Congress and the Executive. If this bill is vetoed and the veto is not overridden, then it will be obvious to all that no compromise could possibly have been effected, since those of us concerned with this legislation have more than leaned over backward to try to pass a bill which can become law.

The evidence presented during the hearings on H.R. 9883 establishes beyond a doubt that a pay increase is warranted. During its consideration of the various pay bills, the committee was faced with the difficult problem of deciding what rate of increase should be proposed. It is my conviction that this decision should be based on a determination of the amount required to provide Federal employees with pay comparable to that in private enterprise. This view recognizes that all that postal and other Federal employees have ever asked of their Government is fair and timely salary provisions.

My motion in committee to amend H.R. 9883 to provide for a 9-percent across-the-board increase was approved by the committee on a conclusion that this amount of increase would achieve reasonable comparability.

The proposed pay increases would apply to slightly more than 1½ million employees of the Federal Government. The 9-percent raise would have meant an estimated cost of approximately \$846 million. The lesser raise will cost about \$680 million. It must be recognized that these 1½ million employees are the people responsible for performing the tasks incident to an annual Federal expenditure of well over \$70 billion. It seems to me that the estimated cost is a completely reasonable price to pay to assure fair compensation to a group of employees who, in the aggregate, bear so great a responsibility.

The opposition to a pay increase has been based primarily on two arguments, neither of which, to me, is persuasive.

In the first place, the administration has argued that a pay increase at this time would have an unfavorable effect on its anticipated \$4.2 billion budget surplus for next year. Certainly, there can be no argument against economical government or against the achievement of a budget surplus by legitimate economies. At the same time, reasonable people will agree, I think, that withholding pay from its work force is too high a price to pay for a budget surplus. This argument against pay increases raises a serious question whether the administration may be seeking to achieve personal objectives and political advantage at the expense of its civilian employees, who are clearly entitled to a salary increase at this time.

The second major argument has been that all efforts to adjust Federal salaries should await the results of a comparative study of Federal and private industry salaries, which has been recently undertaken by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

A5122

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 16

This argument, it seems to me, is completely specious in the light of the overwhelming evidence which shows that Federal employees generally are now far below the levels of comparable salaries in private enterprise. Administration representatives who now oppose pay increases have themselves consistently maintained that the Government has extreme difficulty in recruiting and retaining competent employees in the Government because of disparities in pay. In this connection, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization on December 4, 1959, stated:

In contrast, statutory increases in the Classification Act pay schedules have been much less frequent and have usually trailed far behind such changes in industry. The result has been an almost continuing unfavorable competitive position in the labor market for the kinds and quality of white collar employees needed to staff the varied and complex activities of our Government.

It is difficult to understand what purpose, other than mere delay, would be accomplished by awaiting the results of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' survey in the face of the clear evidence we have before us.

The evidence presented during the hearings on H.R. 9883 and a number of companion bills establishes without any doubt that immediate and substantial Federal employee salary adjustments are necessary in the interest of efficiency in the Government and fairness to Government employees. The evidence clearly shows that (a) Federal employees are substantially below the level of the national economy; (b) that the salaries paid Federal employees do not compare favorably to salaries paid for comparable work in private enterprise; and (c) that the rates of salary increases for Federal employees have lagged far behind the rates of increases in private enterprise over a period of years.

The following are only a few of the many comparisons which were presented during the Committee hearings and which convince me that pay increases are justified at this time.

The largest single group of employees in the postal service are the clerks and letter carriers. The responsibilities of their jobs have been compared to those of policemen and firemen. Postal clerks and carriers are paid in a salary range of from \$4,035 to \$4,875 per year. This is generally about \$1,000 a year below the pay ranges of policemen and firemen in 60 large metropolitan centers. In one of the largest cities, for example, policemen and firemen are paid in a range of \$6,396 to \$6,828, roughly \$2,000 more per year than postal clerks and carriers.

The average weekly earnings of postal letter carriers is \$89.23. A recent Department of Labor publication shows that the average weekly earnings of production workers in various industrial groups ranges from a low of \$91.30 to a high of \$118.13. In other words, in January 1960 the lowest paid group of industrial workers earned \$2 per week more on the average than did the postal employees. The highest paid group of industrial workers earned approximately

30 percent more than the average postal employee.

The same unfavorable comparison is shown between Federal employees in the classified service and employees on comparable jobs in private enterprise. For example, evidence has been presented to show that in 10 selected cities in the country tabulating machine operators earn an average of from \$4,487 to \$5,321 per year. Federal employees doing the same kind of work are paid \$3,814 per year. Draftsmen in private industry earn from \$5,686 to \$6,443 per annum as compared to Federal pay for the same work of \$4,560 per year.

A recent Bureau of Labor Statistics survey shows that guards in private industry in various cities are paid at rates ranging from \$1.80 per hour to \$2.45 per hour. The entrance pay for guards in the civilian service in the Government is \$1.57 per hour and the maximum rate a guard can earn is \$1.84 per hour.

I think these few examples of comparable salary rates are sufficient to show without any doubt that the current rates of pay for Federal employees are substantially below those of comparable workers in private enterprise. Equally conclusive evidence has been presented to show that the salaries paid to Federal workers have not kept pace with the increases and cost of living and as a result it is now necessary for far too many Federal employees to accept outside spare time employment in order to provide their families with the necessities of life.

It has also been shown, and this is admitted by administration representatives, that a great deal of the turnover of technical and professional people in the Government results from the Government's inability under existing salary scales to successfully compete with private industry for the services of those capable and well qualified necessary to perform many of the Government's functions.

I urge favorable action on this bill in order to recognize fairly and equitably the loyal, devoted service of the Government's civilian employees by giving them pay more nearly comparable to that enjoyed by their counterparts in private enterprise. Favorable action would further assure the Government's ability to recruit and retain the employees who have the qualifications and abilities to carry out the important responsibilities necessary to the preservation of the Government.

As the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, I was the first Member of the House to join our colleague, Representative THOMPSON, in signing the discharge petition which succeeded in bringing this bill before us, a discharge petition I am glad to say that I persuaded many other Members of the House also to sign. It is unfortunate that we had to take this unusual means of obtaining signatures from a majority of the membership in order to overcome obstructions to the orderly consideration of this bill under normal procedures.

Those of us who favor fair treatment for Uncle Sam's rank-and-file employees

have had to wage a constant battle against an unsympathetic administration which flatly opposes pay raises for the average worker. This has been the policy from President Eisenhower on down. Week after week, we sat in Committee listening to the pros and cons on this legislation, and throughout the period of the hearings there was a constant drumbeat of administration propaganda against any pay increase whatsoever.

At this moment, we are being told that if we reduce the size of the proposed increase even further—say to 5 percent—and perhaps add higher postal rates to it, there is a possibility, or a remote outside chance, that the President may sign such a bill. It is all very nebulous. Yet, all of the time we were considering this legislation in Committee, the administration laid down a flat rule of no raise at all for the rank-and-file of employees.

On the other hand, no administration has ever worked harder at trying to obtain pay increases for the policymakers of the Government—particularly those in politically appointive offices. The top level of Civil Service, in these recent years of the Eisenhower administration, has been changed almost entirely into a patronage pool for the Republican National Committee. Career Government employees are given to understand that it helps to have Republican ties if they expect to obtain promotion to the top posts in what is supposed to be the career service. I am sure if it could find a way to provide pay increases only for Government employees in so-called policymaking jobs—and under this administration that covers a multitude of employees with political sponsorship—the administration would gladly support such a bill. But this bill—to reward the entire classified and postal services—is bitterly opposed on grounds that the cost of living has not risen enough since the last pay raise to justify the proposed increases so why enable any Government worker to get ahead?

When organized labor was fighting for the principle of wage escalation to meet increases in living costs, many of the same people now deciding policy for this administration bitterly opposed the idea as something right out of Moscow. Actually, of course, collective bargaining as we know it is the farthest thing away from the Russian system, but you would not think so to hear some of the complaints about unions—all unions.

It is now an accepted part of our industrial economic structure, of course, that cost-of-living increases should be reflected in wage settlements. But that is by no means the only measure of justifiable wage settlements in industry. Industry and labor also agree on increases reflecting increased productivity, on increases based on increased complexity of the work, on increases based on higher educational requirements or longer periods of training and so forth.

Now why should none of these things be taken into consideration in determining the wages of our Government employees? According to the adminis-

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5123

tration, the only gauge should be living costs. I disagree. I do not believe we must have a static wage structure in Government since we certainly do not have one in any other field. It is not enough, under the American system, that a worker stay even with his earning power of 10 or 20 years ago in terms of real income. Our economy has prospered because most workers steadily, over the years, have been able to improve their standard of living—which requires increase over and beyond living cost increases.

In the postal system, I can say from firsthand knowledge that low wages are a major cause of poor employee morale and much turnover in personnel. We are forcing out good people who had intended to make their careers in the postal service. They cannot afford to remain. Those who take pride in the service, who have long years of seniority, and who grew up in the post office and have developed a dedication to the public service, have suffered real financial hardship in recent years as workers in other fields obtained, through collective bargaining, far better pay scales than the postal employee. Many postal workers are on double duty, taking other off-hour jobs in order to make ends meet. This is not fair to them or to their families, and it is not fair to the taxpayer who wants and expects alert and wide awake and conscientious service from the post office.

This is not the time, perhaps, to go into the other problems of the postal people under the weird operational policies now in effect, but the combination of low pay in comparison to other workers plus the aggravations of trying to keep up with the razzle-dazzle of post office directive and guidelines and experimentation in mail routing policies—policies which seem to be based on a program of change merely for the sake of change—make the postal service a most unhappy place these days. A wage raise will help, at least, to make it a little pleasanter until we can get rid of bungling and chaos in the Department.

For the career classified employee, the situation has not been quite as unhappy as it has been for the postal employee in recent years. The people brought in by the Eisenhower administration to run the other Government departments nearly all started out on the assumption that Government workers were drones and morons, but gradually changed their opinions after discovering to their surprise the quality of work done by the career employees and their conscientious devotion to duty. So it has not been fashionable lately in most agencies—as it has been during the past 7 years in the Post Office Department—to regard the Government employee as a brainless, slipshod, disinterested worker. Nevertheless, Government employment has not yet been restored to the professional prestige it enjoyed prior to this administration, and pay scales have not kept pace with the rates paid to people with similar skills in industry and the professions. This bill now before us will help to correct some of the inequality.

It is on the whole a good bill. We on the committee worked long and hard on it. It deserves not only the votes it will receive to assure its passage here today but sufficient additional votes to show we can overcome a veto. I hope every Member who sincerely believes in the importance of the work done by our classified and postal employees will make his convictions meaningful by supporting this bill. Regardless of our politics, we all know how devoted our postal employees have been in the past—how careful and conscientious and dedicated to service. That spirit is now unfortunately going out of the postal service—has been going out of the service—because of the way the career people have been treated by their top bosses in Washington. Many postal workers more and more take the attitude of "What's the use?" This trend must be reversed. The place to start is on pay scales—right now. I hope with new leadership in the Department in Washington we can take care of the other side of this problem—the operational chaos and bungling. Congress cannot solve that problem right now—the voters must act first. But we will solve it, I hope, next year.

Thank you.

Medical Payments for Elderly Citizens Legislation Must Be Enacted by the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist, Mr. Walter Lippmann, points out in his article in the Washington Post today that there is nothing un-American in the principle that Americans shall be compelled to save "so that they can meet the needs of their old age with the self-respect which comes from being entitled to the benefits because they have paid the cost out of their own earnings."

In my opinion, this statement goes to the heart of the issue of medical payments for the elderly. The Ways and Means Committee has recommended a plan under which elderly persons will be given medical benefits coverage under the social security system. I certainly hope that this legislation is soon brought to the floor for debate and that it is enacted by Congress this year.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "A Challenge That Can't Be Ducked" which appeared in the April 16, 1960, issue of Business Week. The article points out:

The problem basically is that the aged are high-cost, high-risk, low-income customers. Their health needs can be met only by themselves when they are young, or by other younger people who are still working. The only way to handle their health problem,

therefore, is to spread the risk and costs widely. And that can best be done through the social security system to which employers and employees contribute regularly. By comparison with the heavily subsidized schemes, this approach has the advantage of keeping old people from feeling that they are beggars living off society's handouts.

Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of elderly citizens in my congressional district who have written to me or talked to me personally about their concern over the costs of possible hospitalization. They worry about the day when they might suffer from an injury or require an operation, the cost of which would wipe out their savings of a lifetime, or place them deeply in debt. The Congress must fact up to the realities of this problem facing our senior citizens.

Lame Duck "Lameducks"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles:

[From the Palm Beach Post, June 3, 1960]

**COLLINS POOR CHOICE TO HEAD
CONVENTION**

(By Drew Pearson)

If Paul Butler, the "lameduck" chairman of the Democratic National Committee, wanted to curry favor with the South by naming Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida, as the permanent chairman of the Democratic National Convention, he failed badly.

Governor Collins, delightful and charming as he is, does not rate as compared with Congressman Hale Boggs, of Louisiana.

In fact, many southerners are describing the action of Butler in putting across Governor Collins as the appointment of a lame duck by the "lameduck" chairman of a "lameduck" committee.

Here is the lineup of the lame ducks:

Governor Collins himself is soon retiring as Governor of Florida and failed to elect his choice as his successor.

Chairman Butler has just been made a lame duck by the Democrats of Indiana, who have elected Alex Campbell, former assistant attorney general, to be national committee-man from Indiana.

Peggy Ehrmann, the Democratic committeewoman from Florida who nominated Governor Collins, was defeated for reelection to the Democratic National Committee the same day.

Camille Gravel, Jr., Democratic national committeeman from Louisiana, who failed to back Boggs, was defeated a few days later by the Louisiana State Democratic Committee at Baton Rouge by a vote of 100 to 1. The only vote cast for his reelection was that of Gravel himself.

The irony of the situation lies in the fact that in 1954, when Butler was first made chairman of the Democratic National Committee in New Orleans, he was nominated by Congressman Boggs. Two years later Adlai Stevenson was determined to kick Butler out as chairman. He came to Boggs with fire in his eyes and some unprintable

A5124

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 16

things in his language regarding Butler. Boggs at that time stepped in and saved Butler. He got Speaker SAM RAYBURN to help him.

But the other day it was Butler who swung the Democratic committee against Boggs for permanent chairman. As a sop to Gravel, who failed to support Boggs, Butler turned around and made Gravel chairman of the credentials committee to decide on what Democratic delegation shall be seated in Los Angeles.

[From the Birmingham News, June 4, 1960]
BUTLERIAN BOO-BOOS

Several moves of Paul Butler stand sharply revealed. They do him no credit and indicate further that the national Democratic Party is in sore need of somebody with a good political head on his shoulders.

Butler was instrumental in throwing the permanent chairmanship of the convention to Governor Collins of Florida at almost the same time that Collins' "moderate" candidate for Governor of Florida was being voted down; Collins himself goes out of office soon and his future political weight in his home State could be in doubt.

Butler himself after the current term ending with the convention's close is being replaced as national committeeman by Indiana Democrats.

Peggy Ehrmann, Democratic committee-woman from Florida, who placed Collins in nomination for the permanent chairmanship, the same day she made the formal Collins nomination was defeated for the post she has held.

Camille Gravel, of Louisiana, previously booted out of national committee status by his fellow Louisianians but kept on by Butler, was made cochairman of the national convention credentials committee. This man who is to help run the meeting deciding who gets convention seats a few days later was thrown out once more by the Louisiana State Democratic Committee by a vote of 100 to 1.

A wide variety of Democrats—and not just southerners—from time to time over the past year or two have openly expressed disgust with the Butler approach, maneuver, and decision. It seems to us, and not just from a Deep South point of view, that national rank and file Democrats would have done the party a service to have replaced Butler with some middle-road political thinker of capacity quite a while ago. Butler just doesn't seem very smart.

With a Stevenson, a Kennedy, a Symington, a Humphrey seemingly key Democratic policymakers on a campaign basis, enough national Democrats apparently felt Butler would be in step.

Evidence grows that the whole situation may have resulted from a misconception of the true national Democratic temper, and the temper of the people.

Hon. Henry J. Latham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to advise my colleagues of an honor bestowed upon a former Member of this body, and a very dear friend of mine, Hon. Henry J. Latham. On Sunday, June 12, 1960, St. John's University, New York, conferred upon Henry

J. Latham, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, the honorary degree of doctor of laws. The citation reads as follows:

"A wise man," wrote Bacon, "will make more opportunities than he finds." Fortunately for us Americans the existing ones suffice. In the field of education, for instance, how fruitful are the opportunities for professional education available in our evening schools. Those who take advantage of such opportunities are to be commended for their preceptiveness, perseverance, and intellectual energy. Exemplifying these qualities is Henry J. Latham, who completed his preprofessional and professional education in the evening: he studied prelaw at St. John's University and obtained two law degrees—the LL.B. and LL.M.—at Brooklyn Law School of St. Lawrence University. For more than 25 years thereafter he has practiced law and gained a broad experience in all fields of law. In 1940 he was elected a member of the State legislature, a position he left to enlist in the U.S. Navy during World War II. While still serving overseas, he was elected to Congress in 1944, and was reelected for a total of seven terms. This fact alone is ample evidence of his effective and conscientious performance of duty. As further testimony to his ability, proven character, and the high regard he inspires, he was elected in 1958 a justice of the supreme court on a bipartisan slate. Esteemed American, Congressman, and jurist, Henry J. Latham merits honoris causa the degree of doctor of laws, because he illustrates the achievement of one who, in passing through life's pilgrimage, has converted the common dust of servile opportunity to gold.

**Salem, Mass., Captain Nicknamed
"Old Glory"**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a newspaper article by Hedrick Smith of UPI and which appeared in the Beverly Evening Times of Beverly, Mass., under the heading of "Originator of 'Old Glory' Nicknamed Captain Driver of Salem, Courageous Seadog." The article follows:

NASHVILLE, TENN.—The man who nicknamed the American flag "Old Glory" was a salty skipper from Salem, Mass., who once had his pet flag sewn into a quilt to keep it hidden from Confederate soldiers.

A few years before that, the skipper, Capt. William Driver, outfoxed a British ship captain who ordered him to lower his flag ("take down them duds") while his crew was celebrating July 4 in a British-held port in India.

On a third occasion, he threatened to blow down his house with cannon shot if anyone dared lower his original "Old Glory" from a window of his home in the Confederate city of Nashville.

Captain Driver was a man of physical and moral courage those unswerving loyalty to the Union developed at sea.

Born March 17, 1803, he was only 13 when he ran away to the sea one morning on his way to Sunday school. At 21, he became a master mariner of a ship and later circled the world twice.

NAME COINED AT SEA

It was during his rugged seafaring days that Driver named a ship's flag "Old Glory." Legend is hazy on when he actually first coined the nickname. But most historians think it was in 1831 when Driver was master of the brig *Charles Doggett*.

The flag was christened at a special ship-board flag-raising, but the nickname "Old Glory" didn't gain much currency until the Civil War.

Driver moved to Nashville in 1837. His flag was hung from a locust tree outside his home on special occasions—July 4, Washington's birthday, St. Patrick's Day and during presidential campaigns—and became the source of good natured kidding.

Secession made his well-known Unionist sentiments unpopular in this city and Driver, fearing for his proudest possession—"I love it as a mother loves a child"—had the original "Old Glory" concealed in a quilt. Twice Confederate parties came looking for it.

Once Driver turned a group away simply by asking for a search warrant. The second time, approached by a band of rebel guerrillas headed by an old neighbor, Driver paced the porch with worry after their demand for the flag.

Finally, he spun and faced the men. "Dick," he said to the leader, "I have known you all your life. If you want my flag, you'll have to take it over my dead body."

The guerrillas left and the flag remained hidden in the quilt until Union troops captured Nashville February 25, 1862. It was a black day for the rebels but a day of glory for Driver and his pent-up Union sentiments.

Pandemonium greeted the Yankee arrival. Driver rushed home, ripped the flag from the quilt, and, escorted by a squad of Yankee soldiers, took "Old Glory" to the State capitol.

The old ship flag was raised amidst cheers of soldiers and a sprinkling of citizens. From those who knew the flag there were cries of "Old Glory."

**Baltic States Freedom Council's Town
Hall Rally**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 12, 1960, it was my privilege to address the Baltic States Freedom Committee's Town Hall Rally in New York City, marking the 20th anniversary of Soviet invasion of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD a copy of my statement and the manifesto of the 20th anniversary of Soviet aggression against the Baltic States issued by the free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN V. LINDSAY, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW YORK, AT THE BALTIC STATES FREEDOM COUNCIL'S TOWN HALL RALLY IN NEW YORK CITY, MARKING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET INVASION OF ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA, JUNE 12, 1960

We meet here both in sorrow and in hope. In sorrow we commemorate the anniversary of the darkness that engulfed the Baltic countries in June 1940; in hope we rekindle